



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,798	08/10/2001	Meng-Hsien Liu	JCLA7606	6304
23900	7590	06/03/2005	EXAMINER	
J C PATENTS, INC.			PARRY, CHRISTOPHER L	
4 VENTURE, SUITE 250			ART UNIT	
IRVINE, CA 92618			PAPER NUMBER	

2614

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/927,798

Applicant(s)

LIU, MENG-HSIEN

Examiner

Chris Parry

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 August 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, Claim 5, wherein the lines are an external overlay to be placed on the surface of the television screen, must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 6, on line 12, the word "collective" is used incorrectly and should be replaced by "collection". On page 6, line 14, the word "are" is used incorrectly and should be replaced by "is". On page 7, line 7, the word "though" is used incorrectly and should be replaced by "through".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: So, as to be in proper compliance, with the "means plus function" in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 6, the examiner recommends that "means to add" be amended to "means for adding". Applicant should make similar changes to the other limitations.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-4, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gottfurcht et al. (U.S. 6,600,497 B1).

In regards to Claim 1, Gottfurcht et al., teaches a simplified system for navigation of the Internet (column 2, line 32). Reference teaches as well, the use of a set-top box,

Art Unit: 2614

also known as a web appliance, which relies on an external display, such as a television or external monitor that would be necessary to view the internet content (column 5, lines 11-14). Gottfurcht et al., teaches in figures 8 and 9B, the use of matrices to create a plurality of selectable sections each with a corresponding identifier.

Regards to Claim 2, Gottfurcht et al. teaches in figure 9B the use of numbers as the corresponding identifier for each selectable section.

For Claim 3, Gottfurcht et al. discloses in figure 5, a remote control that may be used to interface with the set-top box and the keys for digits 0-9 can be found on the remote control (column 5, lines 30-32 and figure 5). These identifiers simplify the process of navigating through the series of matrix layers.

With regards to Claim 4, Gottfurcht et al. discloses in figure 3, a block diagram of a custom terminal hardware architecture that is used for the set-top box. Although Gottfurcht et al. fails to disclose that the set-top box adds the graphical lines to create the matrices, it is deemed to be inherent to Gottfurcht et al. system.

Claim 6, Gottfurcht et al. discloses in figure 9B, identifiers that correspond to each selectable section. Although Gottfurcht et al. fails to disclose that the set-top box adds the identifiers, it is deemed to be inherent to Gottfurcht et al. system.

Regards to Claim 8, Gottfurcht et al., teaches a simplified system for navigation of the Internet (column 2, line 32). Reference teaches as well, the use of a set-top box, also known as a web appliance, which relies on an external display, such as a television or external monitor that would be necessary to view the internet content (column 5, lines 11-14). Gottfurcht et al., teaches in figures 8 and 9B, the use of matrices to create a

Art Unit: 2614

plurality of selectable sections each with a corresponding identifier. To select a section, Gottfurcht et al. teaches the use of a keypad, or remote control, by the user to make a selection, with the set-top box responsive to the identifier entered, which will enlarge the selected section (column 7, lines 53-56).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 7, 9, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gottfurcht et al. (U.S. 6,600,497 B1).

As noted above, the Gottfurcht et al. reference discloses matrix layers that are used to divide up internet content into selectable sections with corresponding alphanumeric identifiers (Figure 9B). When the user enters the corresponding identifier, the set-top box is responsive and enlarges the corresponding section, which displays a new matrix layer. Gottfurcht et al. fails to teach enlarging a selected section along with bordering areas to the size of the previous displayed cell content.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gottfurcht et al. method by superimposing matrices over Web pages to allow for simple navigation and allowing users to enlarge a particular section by inputting an appropriate identifier. Gottfurcht et al. teaches how using matrices and identifiers allow for simple navigation of web content. One would have

Art Unit: 2614

been motivated to superimpose matrices over a Web page, to not only allow users to have simple navigation of a Web page but, also to have the ability to enlarge a particular section along with bordering areas to enhance the detail of the corresponding section of a Web page.

In regards to Claim 9, Gottfurcht et al. teaches in figure 9B the use of numbers as the corresponding identifier for each selectable section.

For Claim 10, Gottfurcht et al. discloses in figure 3, a block diagram of a custom terminal hardware architecture that is used for the set-top box. Gottfurcht et al. fails to disclose that the set-top box adds the graphical lines to create the matrices. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gottfurcht et al by disclosing the graphical lines are added to the visual signal by the web appliance. One would have been motivated to have the lines added to the visual signal by the web appliance for the benefit of allowing the user to view the Web page in different sections.

Regards to Claim 12, Gottfurcht et al. discloses in figure 9B, identifiers that correspond to each selectable section. Gottfurcht et al. fails to disclose that the set-top box adds the identifiers. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gottfurcht et al. by disclosing the identifiers are added to the visual signal by the web appliance. One would have been motivated to have the identifiers added to the visual signal by the web appliance for the benefit of allowing the user to see the corresponding identifiers to each selectable section and link.

Art Unit: 2614

8. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gottfurcht et al. (U.S. 6,600,497 B1).

Regards to Claim 13, as noted above, Gottfurcht et al. teaches the method of creating selectable sections, with corresponding identifiers. However, Gottfurcht et al. fails to teach using identifiers as a method of selecting links on a Web page.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add identifiers to links as a method of selecting links and navigating Web pages. Gottfurcht et al. teaches that technology can evoke fear in certain people (column 1, lines 36-38) and one would have been motivated to add identifiers to links as to even further simplify the process of navigating internet content.

9. Claims 14, 15, 16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gottfurcht et al. (U.S. 6,600,497 B1).

In regards to Claim 14, Gottfurcht et al. teaches, in figure 9B, the use of plurality of graphical lines and identifiers added to the internet content and as previously discussed above a television is used to display the content. It is deemed inherent that the set-top box, as mentioned by Gottfurcht et al., adds the necessary lines and identifiers to the content, as they are necessary for the system. Gottfurcht et al. fails to teach that the set-top box will enlarge a section of a Web page that is displayed on the television screen and as discussed previously, having identifiers that correspond to links appearing on internet content.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the set-top box as disclosed in Gottfurcht et al., by adding

Art Unit: 2614

the ability to enlarge sections of internet content and add identifiers to links. One would have been motivated to add the feature of enlarging sections to the set-top box to allow users to better view text and detailed graphics displayed on the screen. With regards to adding identifiers to links on Web pages, as noted above, adding identifiers would further simplify navigation.

With regards to Claim 15, Gottfurcht et al. teaches in figure 9B the use of numbers as the corresponding identifier for each selectable section.

For Claim 16, Gottfurcht et al. discloses in figure 3, a block diagram of a custom terminal hardware architecture that is used for the set-top box. Gottfurcht et al. fails to disclose that the set-top box adds the graphical lines to create the matrices. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gottfurcht et al by disclosing the graphical lines are added to the visual signal by the web appliance. One would have been motivated to have the lines added to the visual signal by the web appliance for the benefit of allowing the user to view the Web page in different sections.

Regards to Claim 18, Gottfurcht et al. discloses in figure 9B, identifiers that correspond to each selectable section. Gottfurcht et al. fails to disclose that the set-top box adds the identifiers. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gottfurcht et al. by disclosing the identifiers are added to the visual signal by the web appliance. One would have been motivated to have the identifiers added to the visual signal by the web appliance for the

Art Unit: 2614

benefit of allowing the user to see the corresponding identifiers to each selectable section and link.

10. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gottfurcht et al. (U.S. 6,600,497 B1) in view of Beckes et al. (U.S. 4,672,558).

As discussed above, Gottfurcht et al. teaches the method of simplifying navigation of internet content to allow users of all ability to access the Internet. Gottfurcht et al. fails to teach the use of an external overlay as a way to add the necessary lines to create a plurality of sections. However, Beckes et al., discloses a touch-sensitive data input device (Abstract and column 2, lines 3-11) that has a demountable bezel, which establishes a grid of light beams in front of the display screen.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an external overlay to place over top of the television screen, to create the effect of a grid that would divide the screen into the necessary number of sections. Beckes et al. teaches the benefit of having a removable bezel so, it may be moved from display to display as well as the additional advantage of having an additional way to select identifiers on the display. One would have been motivated to create an external overlay for the purposes of moving it from television to television as well as the added benefit of providing a way to make the sections on the screen more prominent.

11. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gottfurcht et al. (U.S. 6,600,497 B1) in view of Beckes et al. (U.S. 4,672,558).

As discussed above, Gottfurcht et al. teaches the method of simplifying navigation of internet content to allow users of all ability to access the Internet. Gottfurcht et al. fails to teach the use of an external overlay as a way to add the necessary lines to create a plurality of sections. However, Beckes et al., discloses a touch-sensitive data input device (Abstract and column 2, lines 3-11) that has a demountable bezel, which establishes a grid of light beams in front of the display screen.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an external overlay to place over top of the television screen, to create the effect of a grid that would divide the screen into the necessary number of sections. Beckes et al. teaches the benefit of having a removable bezel so, it may be moved from display to display as well as the additional advantage of having an additional way to select identifiers on the display. One would have been motivated to create an external overlay for the purposes of moving it from television to television as well as the added benefit of providing a way to make the sections on the screen more prominent.

12. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gottfurcht et al. (U.S. 6,600,497 B1) in view of Beckes et al. (U.S. 4,672,558).

As discussed above, Gottfurcht et al. teaches the method of simplifying navigation of internet content to allow users of all ability to access the Internet. Gottfurcht et al. fails to teach the use of an external overlay as a way to add the necessary lines to create a plurality of sections. However, Beckes et al., discloses a

Art Unit: 2614

touch-sensitive data input device (Abstract and column 2, lines 3-11) that has a demountable bezel, which establishes a grid of light beams in front of the display screen.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an external overlay to place over top of the television screen, to create the effect of a grid that would divide the screen into the necessary number of sections. Beckes et al. teaches the benefit of having a removable bezel so, it may be moved from display to display as well as the additional advantage of having an additional way to select identifiers on the display. One would have been motivated to create an external overlay for the purposes of moving it from television to television as well as the added benefit of providing a way to make the sections on the screen more prominent.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents and articles are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to web appliances and televisions with a set-top box configuration:

U.S. Pat. No. 6,034,689 to White

U.S. Pat. No. 6,226,642 B1 to Beranek et al.

IEEE, Computer Graphics and Applications, "Survey on information appliances", published May/June 2000

Art Unit: 2614

The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to adding a dividing the display into a plurality of sections:


U.S. Pat. No. 5,537,152 to Ishikawa

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chris Parry whose telephone number is (571) 272-8328. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner's Initials: CIP
May 23, 2005


JOHN MILLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600